

Appl. No. 10/782,655  
Response to Final Office Action of January 9, 2006

Response under 37 CFR §1.116 expedited procedure.  
Examining Group: 3851 (MPEP 714.13)

#### REMARKS

Claims 1-11 and 27-28 are pending in the application.

The present amendment is being filed in light of the constructive comments made by the Examiner during a telephone interview. Applicant thanks  
5 the Examiner for his time and these comments, and for the indication of a liberal view towards new issue matters that would necessitate the filing of a continuation.

The Final Office Action was based on claim language that the Examiner indicated lacked necessary structure to distinguish over the prior art. Claims 10  
10 and 11 have been amended to incorporate structural elements that clearly distinguish over the prior art references.

Claim 10 has been amended to incorporate the joint interlock having frictional or interferentially contacting surfaces of first and second belt edges contacted and compressed by the belt force in a direction perpendicular to a  
15 radius of the belt, among other things, which is illustrated in the Specification by, e.g., Figure 1. Clearly Tingskog does not teach or suggest such a structure that provides surfaces contacted by a compressed force in a direction perpendicular to a radius of the belt, but rather discloses a configuration in which the forces (see 5/10-16) force the edge parts to pivot outwards away from the central part.  
20 Since the forces in Tingskog occur in a completely different manner than what is claimed, the amendment to claim 10 clearly distinguishes the present claim 10 from the disclosure of Tingskog.

Appl. No. 10/782,655  
Response to Final Office Action of January 9, 2006

Response under 37 CFR §1.116 expedited procedure.  
Examining Group: 3651 (MPEP 714.13)

With respect to claim 11, similar structural language has been provided which serves to distinguish the present invention from Mayer. Clearly, the belt disclosed in Mayer (Figure 1) does not teach a joint interlock with frictionally or interferentially contacting surfaces contacted and compressed by a force  
5 perpendicular to a radius of the belt. The only contact surfaces in the belt disclosed by Mayer that exist are forces in a direction that is colinear with the radius and not perpendicular to it; furthermore, there does not appear to be any prestressing of the belt material adjacent to the joint.

For these reasons, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the present  
10 claim amendments serve to structurally distinguish the present invention from the art that has been cited against it.

#### CONCLUSION

Inasmuch as each of the objections have been overcome by the amendments, and all of the Examiner's suggestions and requirements have  
15 been satisfied, it is respectfully requested that the present application be reconsidered, the rejections be withdrawn and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned representative if there are further issues remaining with this application.

20

Respectfully submitted,

 (Reg. No. 45,877)  
Mark Bergner  
SCHIFF HARDIN, LLP  
PATENT DEPARTMENT

25

8

AMENDMENT D AFTER FINAL

Appl. No. 10/782,655  
Response to Final Office Action of January 9, 2006

Response under 37 CFR §1.116 expedited procedure.  
Examining Group: 3651 (MPEP 714.13)

6600 Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6473  
(312) 258-5779  
Attorney for Applicants  
Customer Number 26574

5

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being telefaxed to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office telephone number 571-273-8300 and addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on February 3, 2006.

10



---

15

9

AMENDMENT D AFTER FINAL